

**North American Numbering Council**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
July 22-23 1998

---

**I. Time, Date and Place of Meeting:** The North American Numbering Council held a meeting, commencing at 8:30 a.m., at the Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, NW, Room 856, Washington, DC.

**II. List of Attendees:**

A. Council Members

Voting Members

1. Emily Williams
2. David Konczal
3. Woody Kerkeslager
4. Dan Hochvert
5. Roger Werth
6. Ronald Binz
7. Carol Ann Bischoff
8. Brian Fontes/Lori Messing
9. Alan Hasselwander
10. Bernard Harris
11. Peter Guggina
12. Gerry Thompson
13. Vincent Majkowski/Bruce Armstrong
14. Bridget Szczech
15. David Rolka
16. Beth O'Donnell
17. Larry Krevor/Robert Montgomery
18. Dan Gonzalez
19. Joe Kingrey
20. Anna Miller
21. Trent Boaldin
22. Mark Golden/Cathy Handley
23. Mike Bennett
24. Rikke Davis
25. Diane Little
26. Jacques Sarrazin
27. Ed Gould
28. Gerry Rosenblatt
29. Paul Hart

Organization

ALTS  
American Mobile Satellite  
AT&T Corp.  
Bell Atlantic  
Cincinnati Bell  
Competition Policy Institute  
CompTel  
CTIA  
Frontier  
GTE  
MCI  
Mobility Canada  
NARUC  
NARUC  
NARUC  
NCTA  
Nextel Communications, Inc.  
NEXTLINK  
NORTEL  
Omnipoint  
OPASTCO  
PCIA  
SBC Communications, Inc.  
Sprint Corp  
Sprint SpectrumPCS  
Stentor Resource Center  
Teleport  
TIA  
USTA

Special Members (non-voting):

John Manning            ATIS  
Ron Conners            NANPA

B. Commission Employees

Erin Duffy, Alternate Designated Federal Official  
Jeannie Grimes, Network Services Division, CCB  
Linda Simms, NSD, CCB  
Jared Carlson, NSD, CCB  
Greg Cooke, NSD, CCB  
Les Selzer, NSD, CCB  
Marilyn Jones, NSD, CCB  
Gayle Teicher, NSD, CCB

**III. Estimated Public Attendance:** Approximately 28 members of the public attended the meeting as observers.

**IV. Documents Introduced:** Each member received the following handouts:

- (1) Agenda
- (2) Long Term Number Portability Cost Recovery, Neil Fried, Competitive Pricing Division, CCB, FCC
- (3) NBANC NANPA Fund Performance Status Report & Funds Projection
- (4) Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report
- (5) GTE's Comments on the COCUS/LINUS Discussion
- (6) MCI Recommendation: COCUS & LINUS Data Reporting Obligations
- (7) Local Number Portability Administration (LNPA) Working Group Report
- (8) WWITF LNPA Report
- (9) Numbering Resource Optimization Working Group Report
- (10) NANC Abbreviated Dialing Ad Hoc Working Group Report
- (11) MCI - COCUS & LINUS Data Reporting Obligations, Part 2: Clarification
- (12) Cost Recovery Working Group Report
- (13) Peter Guggina, MCI, letter of July 8, 1998, Re: NANPE & related assumptions

**V. Summary of the Meeting:**

**A. Welcoming Remarks.** Alan Hasselwander, Chairman of the Council, provided welcoming remarks and announced Ron Binz as the new NANC Co-chair.

**B. Approval of Minutes of April and May meetings.** Approved with minor modifications to the May 27th minutes.

**C. Cost Recovery (response to inquiry from Trent Boaldin regarding NANPA funding late fees):** Vince Majkowski and John Ricker (NECA) — John Ricker of NECA explained that

carriers contributing to fund the NANPA, regardless of their size, must pay a minimum of \$100 in late-filing fees to cover administrative expenses incurred by NECA. NECA must perform the same amount of work, whether addressing a late fee from a large carrier or from a small carrier. John Ricker also explained data reporting for funding the NANPA in 1999.

NBANC Report. The current fund balance, as of July 14, is \$1.28 million. The projected receivables are as follows: monthly contributions (U.S. carrier payments) - \$1.74 million; Canada - \$160,000; Dominican Republic - \$17,600; and, non-compliant carriers - approximately \$40,000. To date, payments to Lockheed are \$1.1 million, with \$2.20 million remaining to be paid; payments to NECA are \$83,000, with \$160,000 remaining to be paid. Board expenses total \$4,181 (\$2,868 for reimbursement and \$1,313 for conference calls). The Board agreed to select an external auditor through an RFP to solicit bids. Vince Majkowski noted that the Board is open to suggestions for an auditing firm.

On May 26, 1998, letters were sent to 431 service providers that have not filed their Form 496 or made their NANPA contribution with the NBANC. The letter states that carriers must file data on a timely basis. The form only requires two lines of data, and the late filing fee is \$100.

A copy of the NBANC financials were provided.

The 1999 data collection form was submitted to the FCC for OMB approval.

**D. Industry Numbering Committee (INC) Report -- Jo Gallagher and Cathy Handley.** Issue 102, LRN assignment practices, has reached final closure. INC has not yet completed its review of 1,000 block pooling guidelines. The latest draft of the guidelines is available on the INC web site. The action plan for completion of the guidelines calls for completion by the September NANC meeting. Ms. Gallagher recommended that the draft INC guidelines be included in the September NRO report and that any future changes to those guidelines would be editorial in nature.

The rationale regarding the establishment of service provider and inventory levels was addressed. Ms. Gallagher explained that the service provider inventory is a provider's forecasted demand for numbers, and that the industry inventory is an administrator's forecast of industry inventory. INC had no consensus to revise the previous INC agreement for a 9-month service provider inventory and a 9-month industry inventory. The companies not in support of the 6-month service provider inventory were Ameritech, BellSouth, BellSouth Cellular, GTE, and the USTA. GTE, Ameritech, USTA, and Primeco were opposed to the 6-month industry inventory. In response to a question from Peter Guggina, MCI, Ms. Gallagher explained that the conclusion that there was no consensus on changes to the duration of the inventories represented INC's conclusion, not her personal conclusion.

Chairman Hasselwander invited discussion on the issue of the duration of inventories. The focus should be on defining the number pooling process. Carriers are cautious because the forecasting has been unsatisfactory. Steve Engelman, MCI, stated that MCI's rationale for a shorter interval

is that a 9-month service provider inventory and a 9-month industry inventory of numbers is longer, in total, than an inventory that exists today without pooling. Bernie Harris noted that the 9-month inventories represented a compromise between those parties that desired 12-month inventories and those that desired 6-month inventories. Barry Bishop, Lockheed Martin, noted that in Illinois, 1,000-block administration was dynamic, constantly changing; in fact, service provider and industry inventory intervals have not been finally resolved in Illinois.

Paul Hart added that the Council does not know enough to change the INC recommendation, should accept the 9&9 intervals, and should consider giving NANPA discretion to negotiate with applicants if a request looks unreasonable. Mr. Hart also suggested that NANC review the INC guidelines to determine whether modifications to the guidelines are needed.

The question was put to the NANC whether guidelines for allocation of numbers should be based on forecasts. There was agreement on this topic. The question of who should develop these guidelines was placed before the NANC and Lockheed Martin agreed to provide draft guidelines one week before the August NANC meeting. It was also agreed that the issue of who would enforce the guidelines would be addressed at the next meeting.

The NANC returned to the issue of inventory durations. There was general discussion that if the NANC approved the INC 9-month inventories, it could revise those inventories at a later date. The issue placed before the NANC was "who is opposed to accepting 9-month service provider and industry inventories subject to review of real-world data." Peter Guggina and Beth O'Donnell opposed the motion. Chairman Hasselwander determined there was consensus on the issue.

There was a brief discussion regarding the amount of time necessary to place a 1,000s block of numbers into service. The interval for response to a request of 1000 block to allocation is seven days. The allocation date to effective date interval is 21 days, to allow for LERG updates and flow through to the SP's internal support systems. There is testing underway for a shorter 10 day cycle. There was no opposition to bringing up this topic in the future when the inventory issue would also be addressed.

*Regarding the question of policing of forecasts and accurate forecasts.* John Manning stated that INC guidelines are in draft form and available on the ATIS web site. Jo Gallagher added that under section 8.3, the draft guidelines do not preclude reclamation of contaminated blocks.

*Should NANPA have discretionary power relative to carrier forecast?* Bernie Harris noted that the INC guidelines should address that issue. The question was raised as to whether, as a matter of policy, the NANPA should review forecasts and be empowered to take appropriate action. There was general agreement on the threshold question of the discretionary authority for NANPA and that NANPA needs an objective guideline with an escalation process. Several members noted that without the FCC's backing, there may be much more controversy. Dave Rolka added that forecasts have to be mandatory, binding and enforceable. Trent Boaldin commented that guidelines should be structured to prevent abuse without resorting to a rule.

Chairman Hasselwander posed three questions: *Should there be guidelines for managing forecasts provided by carriers to the 1000s block number pooling administrator? If so, who should recommend them? If so, should there be enforcement and where?*

Guidelines should be developed on one forecasting tool or process that will feed all numbering administration. This information would be accessible to both state and federal regulators. Ron Conners stated that the industry will have a large voice as this process develops. It was suggested that the design for the forecast should be developed in the first instance; then the question of NANPA's authority can be addressed. Chairman Hasselwander stated that the guidelines for forecasting will be developed at the NRO with input from NANPA.

There was agreement that guidelines for resource allocation need to be developed. The NANPA will provide input for guidelines. Bernie Harris suggested that NANPA should brainstorm the resource allocation issue, then the basic structure would be agreed to within NANC. Consensus was reached that NANPA will provide suggested guidelines for forecast allocation. OPASTCO opposed. NANPA will provide a recommendation and a document in advance of the next meeting.

It was agreed that the state jurisdictional issue will be debated at the next meeting. It was noted that NANPA jurisdiction also covers areas that are not in the United States. Additionally, some states have opted to perform the NPA relief portion of the CO Code Administration function. The enforcement issue will be discussed at the August meeting.

Agreement was reached on the need for guidelines concerning how numbering resources are allocated based on forecasts; the granting, or withholding, of resources; and the rationality of the forecasting. NANPA will take the first cut and will provide a draft document one week prior to the next NANC meeting. Regarding enforcement, NANC members should come prepared to discuss a policy resolution on that question and on who ought to work the details of that decision.

Regarding NANPA authority and non-U.S. NANP participants, questions were raised as to whether they should be governed by similar rules and, if so, how the guidelines would be enforced. The non-U.S. position will be provided at the next meeting. The CRTC is sensitive to this issue and Jacques Sarrazin agreed to take the NANC position back to the CRTC and to Leo Nevel. The CRTC will provide input at the next meeting.

The Council accepted the INC recommendation on the 9&9 month inventory levels, subject to review later when more empirical data is presented. It was noted that a future goal may be to merge the LERG with the NPAC, at some point in time. It was noted that consideration should be given to, and NANC will need to look at, non-LNP capable carriers. The NANC will look at this issue in the future, along with the 9&9 issues and the use of more efficient systems.

***E. Local Number Portability Administration Working Group Report.*** Woody Kerkeslager reported that he is retiring from AT&T, and Terry Appenzeller has moved on to another

Ameritech assignment. Three new co-chairs of the LNPA WG have been nominated, representing ILEC, CLEC and wireless interests, and will be voted on at the August 12-13th meeting. They are: Tom Sweeney, AT&T, Anne Cummins, AT&T Wireless, and Marilyn Murdock, SBC. The existing LNPA WG has been reorganized into one integrated WG; in effect the T&O Task Force will become the new working group and the WWITF will become a subcommittee (WWISC). The change in management process will be handled at the WG level. Additional subcommittees will be created as needed to address specific projects.

Tom Sweeney, AT&T, reviewed the WG's number pooling recap on NPAC requirements for number pooling. A timeline was developed for delivery of preport (PP) with efficient data representation (EDR) in a 1000 block number pooling environment with a target implementation date of December 1999. The requirements will be completed and sent to the LLCs and LM by December 28, 1998, with a March 3, 1999 projected completion date for the vendor statement of work and price negotiations. *See* handout for further details. In response to LM concerns directed to the LLCs regarding the delivery of multiple customer deadlines, the T&O recommended that the wireless change orders be combined with only high priority NPAC Release 2 change orders. The LLC's are negotiating with LM for the development of this expanded wireless release.

The next national Law Enforcement LNP meeting discussing LM IVR system and other LNP law enforcement issues, including federal and state law enforcement agency impacts related to number portability, will be held on August 21, at the Ameritech, Training Center, 350 N. Orleans, 4th Floor, Room 437, Chicago, Illinois, from 10 a.m.- 4 p.m. CST. Robin Meier is the point of contact and may be reached by email: Robin.meier@a1il.ameritech.com

**WWISC Report - Anne Cummins.** The integrated process flows are expected to be completed by September. An agreement on the business hours between wireless and wireline entities is anticipated at the August meeting. A liaison letter was directed to the OBF regarding support for the modified wireless LSR process, recommending a minimum set of data fields. Wireless has been requested to submit processing forecasts for the NPAC in order to adjust NPAC performance criteria and provide adequate capacity for wireless porting.

Marilyn Murdock stated that because 95% of wireless carriers are MIN based, separating MIN from MDN has become an issue. The *First Report & Order* directed all wireless carriers to maintain nation-wide roaming. Every MIN based provider must upgrade OSS network elements and billing or 911 emergency service will not work. All wireless carriers will have to flash-cut on the same day.

Cathy Handley asked whether they have discussed how to reach all wireless carriers concerning this issue. It was noted that a liaison has been established with the wireless industry via CTIA and PCIA. CTIA/PCIA met last week with the WWISC and is working with Lori Messing. The WWISC LNP subcommittee has a life expectancy until the end of the year.

**F. Numbering Resource Optimization Working Group Report -- Mike Whaley.** The NRO has not met since June, but held a conference call on July 9th. Its next face-to-face meeting will be Friday, July 24. The NRO's task forces continue to proceed with work.

Beth O'Donnell asked whether UNP (unassigned number porting) was an interim measure, or whether states could use it permanently. Following a discussion of different methods of number conservation, Chairman Hasselwander noted that the ATF will analyze each method of conservation against a checklist of criteria.

It was noted that 20 states had not responded to questionnaires sent to them by the NRO. Vince Majkowski asked for the identity of these states, so that they can be asked whether they really had nothing to add to the debate on number conservation. Dan Hochvert noted that the NRO also might want to ask questions of NANP member countries.

Mike Whaley noted that the September report would be as detailed as possible, and would identify areas where further reports would be forthcoming. Chairman Hasselwander stated that the INC 1000s block guidelines, to the extent available, will be made part of the report. The NRO report will contain the requirements needed and high level guidelines also will be included. Joe Kingrey, NORTEL, added that T1S1.6 has been asked for its input, and has not yet responded to Mike Whaley's July 6<sup>th</sup> letter. Chairman Hasselwander stated that in the absence of a response from T1S1.6, the ITN TF will work the issue to the extent it can, recognizing that T1S1.6 is in the best position to provide technical requirements.

Direction was provided to the NRO. The NRO report is a dynamic document, and will have to be developed by contributions, to the extent possible. Where possible, NANC members should attempt to solicit the resources to assist this effort. It was noted that there are currently 3 different architectures under consideration by the ITN TF.

Chairman Hasselwander requested that the NRO do as much as it can so that the September 23 report can be as detailed as possible, given the deadline. Fred Gaechter, ITN TF Co-Chair, stated they are working the technical issues, that vendor and SP perspectives are being considered, and that high level requirements will be provided for the September report.

**G. N11 Ad Hoc Working Group Report and Recommendation -- Paul Hart.** The WG held conference calls on July 8 and July 20, and established August 14, 1998, as the end date for vendor responses for the final report to NANC in September. During the July 20 conference call there was disagreement on the intent and uses of abbreviated codes to complete calls to network addresses. One point of view for utilizing AIN to permit access to additional service structures was made by Marty Tennant, with some support from MCI. LECs want an explanation on the intent for such usage, other than to complete calls. Lori Messing commented that the WG is waiting for a technical service description. Joe Kingrey added that vendors cannot provide an alternative when they do not understand the service request. There will be dialogue with the

vendors at the face-to-face meeting in Dallas on August 25-26, 1998, on AIN, switch translation and on access to that functionality.

Woody Kerkeslager asked about the cost of using abbreviated numbers and about the possible consumption of numbers that could be used for other purposes. Peter Guggina stated that the WG was not asked to look at costs specifically.

**H. *COCUS and Proposed Line Number Utilization Survey.*** Contributions were provided by Bernie Harris, GTE, and Mary DeLuca, MCI.

GTE does not believe additional regulations are needed. After NANPA transitions all the CO Code Administration functions, GTE believes that there should be no reluctance on the part of carriers to provide forecast data. Industry should regulate itself, with the FCC providing a framework, but not detailed regulations. There is concern that an over-forecast might result if resellers are required to provide data. This information should be required in support for requests for resources, as well as to provide utilization data. GTE believes NANPA already has the authority to refuse to provide resources.

Resellers concerns. Often resales are made to more than one ILEC or CLEC within a single rate center. In addition, concerns were raised about giving information directly to the wholesaler. There is no easy answer to this situation. It was suggested that the NANC needs a tutorial on unbundling, with a list of all service providers (entities) which obtain numbers from NANPA. The Council also needs to know who the NANPA should rely on to obtain forecast and utilization information and how much precision really is needed.

Mary DeLuca stated that MCI believes no new rules are needed for forecasts. The FCC could release a declaratory ruling clarifying and interpreting the FCC's current numbering regulations, which MCI believes require data reporting. This would give NANPA the support it needs for enforcement activities. The FCC also could delegate the authority to the States to enforce data collection. MCI has not addressed the reseller issue yet. *See* handout for additional detail.

Vince Majkowski agreed with this approach. Under the proposed LINUS model, resource users are required to participate. States should be delegated the authority to enhance the LINUS concept, and to require everyone to participate, both wireless and wireline carriers.

Trent Boaldin added that NANPA has asked for more explicit guidelines to enforce the assignment of resources. Bernie Harris commented that collecting the data should be accomplished via a uniform data set across the industry. The industry and LM should review the data set specified by NANC (NRO), then proceed with the development of information systems on an economical basis.

Ron Binz suggested that the FCC state unequivocally that the States have access to the NANPA's data, and should back up NANPA, as long as reasonable rules and/or guidelines are in place. States should have broad authority to enforce collection by the NANPA. Paul Hart added that

NANC members should review the existing rules, consult with their respective constituencies, and recommend the least intrusive action by the FCC.

Dave Rolka stated that with regard to reporting requirements, FCC rules have not proved to be self-executing. An explicit acknowledgment of authority from the FCC is necessary before state regulators will have access to forecasting and utilization data. Ron Conners agreed and suggested consideration of a recommendation for a FCC rule to allow NANPA to withhold initial assignments or subsequent requests for additional resources. The enforcement mechanism for the failure to submit data should be the withholding of resources. This issue will be placed on the August agenda, and will be reviewed with NANPA.

**July 23, 1998**

**I. Presentation on Long-Term Number Portability Cost Recovery. Neil Fried, Enforcement Division, CCB.** Neil Fried reviewed the *Third Report and Order*, FCC 98-82 (rel. May 12, 1998), which adopted long term number portability cost-recovery rules. The costs are divided into three categories: (1) shared costs - incurred by the industry as a whole, *e.g.*, administration of regional data bases; (2) carrier-specific costs directly related to number portability, and (3) carrier-specific costs not directly related to number portability, *e.g.*, costs to carriers to upgrade networks to SS7 and AIN technologies. The distribution of shared costs are attributed regionally to carriers providing service in areas that the database serves. Carriers are to treat their portion of such costs as "carrier-specific" costs related to providing number portability. ILECs may recover their unseparated costs directly relating to providing number portability through federally-tariffed charges; all other carriers may recover their costs by any manner consistent with state and federal laws and regulations. Mr. Fried advised that a public notice seeking comment on the issue of apportioning joint costs, and how to allocate costs between end users and query charges, has been released. Comments are due by August 3, 1998, and replies by September 16, 1998.

**J. COCUS/LINUS -- Discussion continued. Glenn Manishin, MCI,** provided a new handout, COCUS and LINUS Data Reporting Obligations, Part 2: Clarification, on the obligation to report on assigned NXXs. MCI's position is that NXX assignees have an obligation to make timely and accurate reports on their assigned NXXs. States would have access to the NANPA data and would be the arbitrator in resolving any outstanding issues about the data provided by the NXX assignee that the NANPA might question. With respect to the role of resellers, more study is needed on the relationship to find who has access to the usage information. Currently, carriers consider NXXs 100% utilized (and report as such) after a subsequent assignment to a reseller, although the carrier does not know, nor should it know, if the reseller has actually activated the numbers. Business plans are proprietary and agreements between two service providers are confidential. MCI believes that it is clear that more information on the reseller issue is needed.

Chairman Hasselwander posed the following question: *If States act as arbitrators, what happens with carriers with multiple state obligations?* A number of issues were raised including binding arbitration, jurisdictional issues, and wireless concerns.

Mike Bennett supported the MCI memo, and added that LM wants muscle. Mr. Bennett suggested that NANPA should gather the data and the states should have access to it. A template should be developed to collect the data, which is particularly important because not all states are independently collecting the data.

Larry Krevor commented on provisioning for collecting accurate data and strongly supported periodic collections. He suggested, however, that NANPA should enforce the data reporting requirement and verify data, not the states, with the FCC serving as final arbitrator. Questions were raised regarding the need for an arbitrator (States or FCC) for the validation of data, especially since NANPA is considered a neutral third party. Vince Majkowski added that maintaining the neutrality of the NANPA is important and suggested that NANPA's neutrality could be preserved by requiring parties to go to state regulatory commissions with disagreements. Consensus was reached that enforcement of existing rules for data collection is needed, with OPASTCO opposed.

A discussion ensued on how enforcement should take place, whether it is a combined federal and state responsibility, who should perform audits, and under what circumstances. It was noted that the confidentiality of data must be maintained as a matter of policy. NANC agreed to revisit this issue at the next NANC meeting. In the interim, members should send contributions. NARUC's contribution should address the needs and considerations of the states needs. A NANPA contribution should address its needs and its ability to perform audits. Also, the Telecommunications Resellers Association should be asked to contribute to the discussion, as well as any other interested party. Chairman Hasselwander stated that NANC needs to address the issue of challenges to the accuracy of data at a finer level of detail.

**K. Cost Recovery Working Group Report -- Anne Le Lena.** Ms. La Lena reported that Frank Meeks has been selected as the Co-Chair to succeed John Banuelos, Pacific Bell. Ms. La Lena reported that the NANPA will do a price allocation, using FCC orders and the WG's expertise, in follow up to Trent Boaldin's question on cost recovery for 1000s block administration, number pooling and ITN. Dan Hochvert noted that there are costs to implement 1000s pooling, administration and actual pooling costs. The CR-WG will consider these issues during its next conference call, to be held on July 28.

**L. NANPA Report -- Barry Bishop.** Due to the proprietary nature of costs related to 1000s block number pooling, Mr. Bishop stated that his report would not address the costs associated with the mid-west trial. The Illinois trial was priced on what was needed for that specific application, but with a national perspective. There may not be substantial differences in the applications, but suggestions are welcome. It is anticipated that a master data base for 1000s block resources would interact with the NANPA database using auto-answer; automated work flows would cut costs. LM has prepared a 1000 block management cost set for New York and Illinois. LM projects a 25% savings over CO Code costs. LM will work with a smaller group to determine the fixed price issue on a block basis. Database and administration services are of the same type as those provided to NPAC, with Chicago and Tarrytown locations. The system will

be based on an auto-answer with real time access to apply for blocks, and will utilize highly secure fire walls similar to security used by the banking industry ATM's.

A fee is charged when resources are assigned or reclaimed. A one-time charge also is assessed for ongoing storage space. Pricing is contingent on the final outcome on NANC's recommendations; a firm price will be negotiated at that time. Currently, contaminated records in the database remains an open issue at INC. Estimate of costs within top MSAs would take into consideration the volume of work, materials, and equipment.

**M. *Steering Group Report -- Vince Majkowski.*** Two meetings were held since the last NANC meeting, on June 24 and July 22, 1998. The Steering Group looked at issue of the relationship between LNPA WG and the 7 LLCs; the efficiency of change management administration (CMA); and the adequacy of NANC oversight. The Group suggests that NANC continue to rely on the LNPA WG for exception reports, and from time to time, high level reports on the CMA process. Chairman Hasselwander will send a letter to the LLCs asking for an update on the discussions of possible LLC consolidation and the standardization of change orders.

A process discussion was held on the disagreements that exist concerning NANC's possible modification of working group reports. The SG recommended the following action: (1) if time allows, the disagreement will be communicated to the working group for further review; and (2) if time does not allow, the NANC will clearly indicate that the change to the report is not the product of the working group, through use of a footnote or by clearly titling the report document as a NANC document. The Council agreed to this recommendation.

The SG reviewed BellSouth's suggested modifications to the NANC Working Group Operating Principles, and recommended the following: (1) no change to the original language on the selection of co-chairs by open nomination; (2) no change to the original language concerning establishing and developing meeting agendas; (3) added clarification to the statement concerning the neutrality of co-chairs while acting in a leadership role; (4) as a result of a discussion on the additional issue of "industry representation," agreed to modify the language in four instances to "interest group." The Council accepted the above recommended changes.

**N. *Other Business -- Discussion of Proposals in the July 9, 1998 Letter from Peter Guggina.***

A discussion followed on the MCI letter on INC's consideration of NANP expansion (NANPE). MCI has requested that NANC consider the policy implications of the INC assumptions with respect to NANPE. MCI recommended a NANC letter to INC to request a report on the status of this work. Norm Epstein, INC Co-Chair of the NANPE, stated that the next NANPE INC Workshop is scheduled for a half-day in September. Chairman Hasselwander requested an update from the group on the issues identified in Mr. Guggina's letter and a tutorial/overview at the October NANC meeting. The NANC will discuss this issue after the tutorial.

**VI. Statement of Action Items and Decisions Reached.**

1. INC Report. NANC accepted INC's reaffirmation of the 9 month service provider inventory and industry pool inventories (9&9) based on review of "real-world" data. The issue will be revisited when new data is available. Alan Hasselwander will provide a reminder.

a. It was agreed that there need to be guidelines for resource allocation and the withholding of numbering resources based on forecasts.

b. It was concluded that NANPA will provide a recommendation document one week prior to next NANC meeting addressing recommendations related to (a) above. At that meeting, NANC will make a decision as to if, and where, further development is required.

c. Discuss enforcement/evaluation issues at the next meeting. It will also be decided where any further development will occur. Non-US participants also will be considered. Jacques Sarrazin will dialogue with CRTC. NANPA will also contact CRTC. NANPA will also advise Caribbean jurisdictions.

d. NANC accepted INC's 21 day interval recommendation with the understanding that the issue will be revisited. This issue will be revisited in the same time frame as the 9&9 issue.

### 3. NRO Working Group.

a. Discussion on porting of unassigned numbers.

\* Should not be considered an interim method.

\* Do not constrain the NRO to work the issue.

b. Leadership appeal that NANC members begin review of draft report.

c. NRO should contact Vince Majkowski to notify him as to which states have not responded to the survey.

d. NRO should consider forwarding the survey to NANPA resource users outside the United States.

e. Include as much detail on ITN as possible (in the September Report) with time and resources available.

### 4. COCUS/LINUS.

a. Agreed that enforcement mechanism is required for the provision of data.

\*There is a need for a rule or clarification of an existing rule for the obligation to report data.

\* Continue discussion at August NANC meeting.

b. Contributions solicited before the August NANC meeting on the following issues:

\*Where and how does enforcement take place?

\*Who performs audits and under that circumstances?

\*Appeals

\*Confidentiality

\*NRO will make presentation on reporting details at August NANC meeting.

\*Resellers

A suggested structure for contributions:

- a. Request for data
  - b. Data collection
  - c. Review/questions
  - d. Audit
  - e. Appropriate state or federal regulator for resolution.
5. Abbreviated Dialing Ad Hoc Working Group Report. NANC required final report in September.
  6. Cost Recovery Working Group. Affirmed Frank Meeks as new Co-Chair.
    - Expand activities to include 1000s block administration and pooling and ITN when the CR-WG has sufficient information.
  7. NANPA Report on Statement of Work Net Costs related to 1000s block administration. The Chairman will make a detailed proposal at the next NANC meeting as to how to manage the future interaction with NANPA on this issue.
    - Intent is to utilize the Steering Group, augmented by experts with a legitimate interest, to engage in deliberations and interactions with the administrator.
  8. Discussion of proposals in the Peter Guggina letter dated July 8, 1998.
    - Alan Hasselwander will write a letter to INC requesting an update presentation. Intent is not to delay current work.
    - Initial presentation in the form of a tutorial at October NANC meeting.
  9. Steering Group Report.
    - Relationship between T&O Task Force, LLCs and Lockheed Martin. NANC Oversight of LLCs will be accomplished by exception reporting by the LNPA-WG and from time-to-time will provide NANC with high level reports on the Change Management Process.
    - Reviewed details of NPAC SMS Change Management Process. Alan Hasselwander will direct a letter to the LLCs inquiring about discussions and consideration of consolidation and any process changes that may be desired.
    - Review of consideration of BellSouth suggested modifications and NANC ratification of Steering Group recommendations on NANC Working Group Operating Principles:
      - \*No change to original language on selection of co-chairs.
      - \*No change to original language concerning agenda development.
      - \*Added clarification to statement concerning neutrality of co-chairs.
    - Additional issue raised regarding "industry representation"
      - \* "Industry representative" modified in four instances to "interest group."